

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 11-13, 15, 16, and 18-20 have been amended, and claims 3, 7, 10, 14, 17, and 21 have been cancelled. Applicant respectfully requests further examination of the application in view of the following.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 13, 15-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Wang et al.* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0165719). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Nevertheless, to advance prosecution, Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 20 to clarify the claimed invention.

Voice input as a means for entering information into a computer system is not new. What is new is Applicant's system and method for addressing the problem that, with voice input, a user does not always know what is the acceptable lexicon (dictionary) and grammar. For example, in interacting with a voice-input system for making airline reservations, a user may arrive at a point in the dialog at which it is unclear to the user whether to say, "Book a flight" or "Book a seat." The claimed invention resolves this problem by integrating a speech interface with a user interface that visually prompts the user for spoken input by displaying text suggestions. The user interface provides a form having a plurality of fields for user input. Once the user selects a field on the form and provides a voice command that is recognized by the system, the user interface displays a list of recognized input terms that are appropriate for input into the selected field. The user then speaks the appropriate one of the recognized terms and the system advances and selects the next field on the form.

*Wang et al.* discloses a system that allows a user to input information in spoken form into what is otherwise a user interface of a device such as a handheld computing device or a networked client computer. It includes a speech-recognition feature that interprets the speech and returns data to the device that is responsive to the recognized speech. However, *Wang* does not disclose, teach, or suggest that a user interface provides a form having a plurality of fields for user input, wherein upon selection of one field and receipt of a recognized command spoken by the user, the user interface displays a list of recognized input terms that are appropriate for input into the selected field, as claimed.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that *Wang et al.* does not anticipate claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 20. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 5, 7, 12, 14, 19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wang et al.* in view of *Katsuranis* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0021336). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

A *prima facie* case of obviousness requires, among other things, that all limitations recited in a claim be shown to be present in the prior art. The Examiner does not cite *Katsuranis* as disclosing the limitations discussed above with regard to claims 1, 8, and 15 and claims that depend therefrom. Claims 5, 12, and 19 (as claims 7, 14, and 21 are cancelled) also depend from claims 1, 8 and 15, and they too include limitations that have not been shown to be present in the prior art. Thus, based upon the discussion above, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot stand, and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection as well.

Claims 5, 7, 12, 14, 19 and 21 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wang et al.* in view of *Katsuranis* and further in view of *Dantzig* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0071833). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the same reasons as in the above rejection of these same claims as unpatentable over *Wang et al.* in view of *Katsuranis* alone. That is, as a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires that all limitations recited in a claim be shown to be present in the prior art, and as the Examiner does not cite either *Katsuranis* or *Dantzig* as disclosing the limitations discussed above, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot stand. Applicant therefore similarly respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

**CONCLUSION**

For the above reasons, the foregoing response places the application in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and full allowance granted. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, please contact Bobby Slaton at (972) 477-1497.

Respectfully submitted,  
GARDNER GROFF GREENWALD & VILLANUEVA, P.C.

Dated: February 8, 2008

/Michelle E. Kandcer/

Michelle E. Kandcer, Reg. No. 54,207

GARDNER GROFF GREENWALD & VILLANUEVA, P.C.  
Customer Number 024587  
Telephone: (770) 984-2300  
Facsimile: (770) 984-0098